REMARKS

The Examiner's action of March 3, 2004 is noted in which the claims are rejected under 35 USC 102 in view of Jansky and under 35 USC 103 in view of Jansky with Rodal et al.

Applicant has amended Claim 1 to more particularly point out that the control of an existing wireless phone is from the universal output of a module that is to be connected to the wireless phone. Applicant claims interposing a compiler between the module and the phone for taking signals in one format and reconfiguring them to a format compatible with the phone. Nowhere is this shown or taught in the references cited.

In point of fact, the Jansky reference teaches away from this concept because at Column 7, Lines 24-29 he notes that "the actual coding of the commands to be transferred over the control buses 150-152 is different for each type of cellular phone."

This is exactly the situation or problem that the subject claimed device overcomes.

As to Jansky, he uses a UART. A UART is not a compiler. A UART is a Universal Asynchronous Receiver/Transmitter that provides a computer with the RS232C Data Terminal Equipment DET interface, so that it can talk with other devices. It converts a parallel input to a single bit stream. It is not programmable for any purpose, and certainly not to match a module output with a specialized cell phone bus.

In short, a UART does not have the capability of outputting anything but the RS232 to a particular serial bit stream format. It is not adaptable or programmable as is the claimed compiler.

Moreover, it is no great achievement to simply design an add-on module to be compatible with a phone. It is quite another thing to design a system such that one can "interpose" a

compiler between a standard module and any one of a number of phones to control the phone. Thus, depending on the phone being used, one has a differently programmed compiler that takes a universal output of a standard module and reconfigures the universal output of the module to be compatible with the coding, format system or bus structure of the phone, whatever phone that might be.

Thus, rather than redesigning the module and the coding structure thereof to be compatible with first one phone, and then the next, in the subject invention one provides a compiler that can be inserted between the module and the phone so that one does not have to touch the inner operation of either the module or the phone in order to get them to talk to each other. One merely reprograms the compiler.

Nowhere in the references is the interposition of a compiler for taking signals in one format and reconfiguring them to a specific phone format shown or taught; much less a compiler located between the module and the phone.

Moreover, it would not be obvious, for instance, to utilize the system shown in Figures 5 and 6 of the Jansky reference to control a phone because in Figure 6, which the Examiner points to, the keyboard doing the controlling is in the GPS unit. In the claimed invention the keyboard to be controlled is in the phone.

Thus, in the claimed invention, there is no keyboard on the module to do anything. Rather, in the subject invention, the keyboard is in the phone and signals from the compiler synthetically press the keys of the phone.

In short, nowhere is the problem of adapting a standard module to a standard phone shown or taught in any of the references cited. In point of fact, the references cited indicate that

a specialized configuration of either the phone or the module must be utilized in order to have the two talk to each other.

On the other hand, in the subject invention, there is a compiler interposed between the two units that leaves the coding of the two units alone and performs a conversion process so that one can design, for instance, a GPS module with its own signaling structure and have it control a cell phone with its own particular signaling structure, without having to go in and alter the signaling structures of either.

In view of the above amendment, allowance of the claims and issuance of the case is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert K. Tendler
Reg. No.: 24,581
65 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, MA 02110
Tel: (617) 723-7268

Date: June 1, 2004